

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-23, and 25-37 are pending. Claims 1 and 22 are amended.

Claims 1, 3-23 and 25-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1, 3-23 and 25-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 22 are amended and the support for the amendments are provided throughout the specification, for example, on page 59, lines 12-15; and page 60, line 16 to page 61, line 16. From the above disclosure, it is clear that each state allows only certain command(s) to be executed on the data record for each predetermined state.

In view of the above amendment, the cited support in the specification for the amendments and the above remarks, it is respectfully requested that the above rejections under 35 U.S.C 112, first and second paragraphs be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-23 and 25-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Cordery (U.S. 6,466,921). Applicant submit that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited references, and reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The claimed invention is directed to a system and method for providing public key infrastructure security in a computer network. The system includes a remote database for securely storing a user transaction data record for each user and a remote cryptographic device. Each user transaction data record includes a data element indicating three or more predetermined states for the user transaction data record. For example, a "Raw state," an "Unleashed" state, an

"Assigned state," a "Leased state," and a "Withdrawn" state. (See, for example, specification page 60, line 16 to page 61, line 16.). Moreover, only a predetermined type of commands (operations) are allowed to be executed on the user transaction data record for each predetermined state. (Page 59, lines 12-15; page 60, lines 22-24, and 27-29). The cryptographic device executes one or more of the commands that are allowed for a present state of the user transaction data record. (Page 59, lines 12-15; and page 60, line 16 to page 61, line 16.).

More particularly, the amended independent claim 1 includes, among other limitations "wherein the user transaction data record includes a data element indicating three or more predetermined states for the user transaction data record, wherein only a predetermined type of commands are allowed to be executed on the user transaction data record for each predetermined state," and "executing one or more of the commands that are allowed for a present state of the user transaction data record." Cordery does not disclose the above limitations.

Cordery describes a Database Server 36 where the information is securely stored using secure cryptographic processes. (FIG. 1 and col. 6, lines 36-40). Each meter record in the database Server 36 includes account information, meter freshness data and other postal information. (Col. 7, lines 27-34 and 38-41). The Examiner construes this "freshness data" as a state of the data record "determining "whether a transaction can be performed or not." (Office action, page 6, last sentence.). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

According to Cordery, this freshness data is "data [not data record] that is unique for each transaction." Moreover, "the meter box compares freshness data that is stored in meter box for each meter account to freshness data stored as part of the meter record. (Col. 9, lines 49-54, emphasis added.). In Cordery's system "if the compared freshness data are not identical [meaning the actual data content is being compared], then, at step 230, the meter box ends the transaction and alerts the Function Server 34 for possible tampering." (Col. 9, lines 59-62, emphasis added.). It is clear from the above description that first, the freshness data of Cordery is not the same as the claimed "data element," second, this freshness data does not and can not

allow "only a predetermined type of commands . . . to be executed on the data record [meter data, according to Cordery]."

Additionally, claim 1 is amended to include "three or more predetermined states" for the data record. Clearly, Cordery does not disclose this limitation.

In summary, there is no teaching or suggestion of a "wherein the user transaction data record includes a data element indicating three or more predetermined states for the user transaction data record, wherein only a predetermined type of commands are allowed to be executed on the user transaction data record for each predetermined state," and "executing one or more of the commands that are allowed for a present state of the user transaction data record," in Cordery. As a result, amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Cordery and thus is patentable over the cited references.


Amended independent claim 22 includes, among other limitations "wherein the user transaction data record includes a data element indicating three or more predetermined states for the user transaction data record, wherein only a predetermined type of commands are allowed to be executed on the user transaction data record for each predetermined state, and "controlling the user transaction data record to execute one or more of the commands that are allowed for a present state of the user transaction data record." As explained above, Cordery does not teach the above limitations. Therefore, amended independent claim 22 is not anticipated by Cordery either and thus is also patentable over the cited references.

In short, the independent claims 1 and 22 define a novel and non-obvious invention over the cited references. The remaining dependent claims 3-21, 23, and 25-37 are dependent from claims 1 and 22, respectively and therefore include all the limitations of their respective independent claims and additional limitations therein. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable over the cited references, as being dependent from allowable independent claims and for the additional limitations they include therein.

Appln No. 10/083,236
Amdt date August 3, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2007

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Raymond R. Tabandeh
Reg. No. 43,945
626/795-9900

RRT/clv

CLV PAS748535.1-*08/3/07 10:05 AM